

U.S. Appl. No. 09/844,354
Reply to Office Action dated May 18, 2006

PATENT
450100-4138.1

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1, 11-13 and 21-25 are independent. Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-25 are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically on pages 24-26. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claim 12, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, has been amended, thereby obviating the rejection.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,585,838 to Lawler, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Lawler") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,198 to Roop, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Roop").

U.S. Appl. No. 09/844,354
Reply to Office Action dated May 18, 2006

PATENT
450100-4138.1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“An information providing apparatus, comprising:...

a second providing section for providing layout information which relates to a layout of the electronic program guide information when displayed on a screen, and wherein the first information and the second information each include a tag to enable data included therein to be associated with the layout information; and

wherein said electronic program guide information is displayed according to media on which said data or at least one of said first information and said second information is provided.” (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Lawler relates to a program time guide for an interactive viewing system which allows a user to control the time and channels for which program information is displayed. The user can navigate through the program time guide to identify and select desired programs. The program time guide displays information for various types and sources of programming by assigning each program source a channel number. Selecting a program on a particular channel causes the system to tune to an associated frequency to receive video signals, launch a computer executed application which generates displayed information, or to perform some other activity associated with that channel or program.

As understood by Applicants, Roop relates to transmission and utilization systems which transmit TV schedule data and associated network control messages provided by a computer as packets via the Video Blanking Interval lines in the TV signal from various television program providers. This data is acquired by regional data processing systems and forwarded by the regional data processing systems to subscriber units and used to construct an internal database. This internal database can be accessed by the subscriber unit to display a TV schedule for the channels that are received by the user's TV.

U.S. Appl. No. 09/844,354
Reply to Office Action dated May 18, 2006

PATENT
450100-4138.1

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Lawler or Roop, taken either alone, or in combination that would teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 1.

Specifically there is no teaching or suggestion of an information providing apparatus wherein said electronic program guide information is displayed according to media on which said data or at least one of said first information and said second information is provided, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 11-13 and 21-25 are also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11-13 and 21-25 are patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent on an independent claim discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

U.S. Appl. No. 09/844,354
Reply to Office Action dated May 18, 2006

PATENT
450100-4138.1

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any
overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.


RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 18 2006

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the
claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to
issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800